

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 23-32 are pending and rejected in the application. Claims 1-22 were previously cancelled. Claims 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollowell (U.S. Patent No. 6,071,056), hereinafter “Hollowell”, in view of Kunii et al. (U.S. App. No. 2001/0023839), hereinafter “Kunii ‘839”, or Kunii et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,059,476), hereinafter “Kunii ‘476”. Claims 23-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over either Kunii, in view of Hollowell. Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Hollowell in view of Kunii, and further in view of Wanesky (U.S. Patent No. 3,263,841), hereinafter “Wanesky”. In this response, claim 23 is amended. Claim 27 is cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. No new matter is added.

Applicants submit the cited references do not teach, suggest or describe at least “[a] method, comprising ... inverting an exchange tray with an exchange containment unit with respect to the packing tray and matching the packing containment unit ... rotating the packing tray and the exchange tray together to move the component from the packing tray to the exchange tray wherein a limiter attached to the exchange tray matches a limiter of the packing tray” (e.g., as described in claim 23).

The Office Action asserts Hollowell shows a limiter, citing elements 61 and 63. *See* Office Action dated 6/5/2007, paragraph 2.

Element 63 in Hollowell is described as an “L-shaped notch”, while element 61 is described as an “L-shaped castellation”. *See* column 2, lines 51-57. Column 2, lines 51-57 state:

Each corner of bottom 17 has an L-shaped castellation 61 (FIG. 4) which seats in an L-shaped notch 63 (FIG. 5) on an adjacent top 15. When the bottom 17 of a first tray 11 is

placed on the top 15 of a second tray 11, the four corner castellations 61 on the first tray 11 will extend into the four corner notches 63 on the second tray 11.

Hollowell describes the use of cited element 63 in combination with element 61. In particular, it states when a bottom of a first tray *is stacked on top* of a second tray, the castellations 61 of the first tray extend into the notches 63 of the second tray. Figures 6-7 of Hollowell confirm this, as they illustrate a first tray *stacked on top* of a second tray, and the castellations 61 of the first tray extending into the notches 63 of the second tray.

First, Applicants submit the L-shaped notch of Hollowell is not the same as a limiter in embodiments of the present application (*e.g.*, as described in claim 23). Moreover, Applicants submit Hollowell fails to teach at least *a limiter attached to an exchange base to match a limiter of an inverted packing tray*.

Kunii '476 and Kunii '839 also fail to teach or suggest at least *a limiter attached to the exchange base to match a limiter of an inverted packing tray* (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1). *See* Kunii '476 and Kunii '839, cited Figures 10-12.

Wanesky fails to make the deficiencies of Hollowell, Kunii '476 and Kunii '839 as well. Wanesky is directed toward methods and an apparatus for removing articles from nests in a work holder. It does not describe at least *a limiter attached to the exchange base to match a limiter of an inverted packing tray* (*e.g.*, as described in claim 1).

Therefore, since each and every limitation is not taught or suggested in the cited references, Applicants submit they are inadequate to support a proper §103(a) rejection of claim 23, and therefore independent claim 23 should be allowed. Claims 24-26 and 28-32 depend from allowable independent claims and therefore are allowable as well.

Application No.: 10/644,947  
Amendment dated: September 5, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of June 5, 2007

It is believed that this Amendment places the application in condition for allowance, and early favorable consideration of this Amendment is earnestly solicited.

If, in the opinion of the Examiner, an interview would expedite the prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

The Office is hereby authorized to charge any fees, or credit any overpayments, to Deposit Account No. **11-0600**.

Respectfully submitted,  
KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: September 5, 2007

By: /Sumit Bhattacharya/  
Sumit Bhattacharya  
(Reg. No. 51,469)

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
333 West San Carlos St., Suite 600  
San Jose, CA 95110

Telephone: (408) 975-7500  
Facsimile: (408) 975-7501